DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 685 HE 010 400

TITLE Study of Salary Between Male and Female Faculty Members of the State of Maryland Public 4-Year Institutions.
INSTITUTION Maryland State Board for Higher Education, Annapolis.
REPORT NO MSBHE-9-77
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 12p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Higher Education; Predictor Variables; *Salary Differentials; *Sex Discrimination; *State Colleges; State Universities; Teacher Promotion; Teacher Salaries; Women Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland; University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

Differences in salaries by sex were studied among the faculty of Maryland public higher education institutions. Focus was on the overall pattern, with consideration of the issue of promotion to rank at the University of Maryland and the state colleges and universities. The scope of the study was limited to full-time, permanent faculty, and data were collected on annual salary, type of contract, highest degree obtained, year the highest degree was awarded, years employed in the current institutions, age, academic rank, years in current rank, HEGIS discipline, and sex. Multiple regression analysis was used. The findings include: (1) On the average, males and females teaching in the same fields, holding the same rank and having the same years of experience in that rank are paid approximately the same salaries. (2) Generally, there does not seem to be evidence of discrimination on account of sex in promotion to academic rank at the state colleges and universities. (3) The University of Maryland's data show a general pattern of different rates of promotion to rank for males and females, but this result may not be definitive evidence of discrimination. (4) Two limitations apply to these conclusions: they are based on aggregate data and do not address individual cases, and the low number of women faculty presented statistical problems in some cases. (LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MSBHE Report # 9-77

ED158685

Study of Salary Equity

between

Male and Female Faculty Members

of

the State of Maryland Public 4-Year Institutions

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

md State Bd of H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Board for Higher Education
Jeffrey Building, 16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland
269-2971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Equal Educational Opportunity Division

Summary

1. On the average, males and females teaching in the same field, holding the same rank, and having the same years of experience in that rank are paid approximately the same salaries. This holds for both segments, the University of Maryland and the State Colleges and Universities.

2. As a general pattern, there does not seem to be evidence of discrimination on account of sex in promotion to academic rank at the State Colleges and Universities.

3. The University of Maryland's data show a general pattern of different rates of promotion to rank for males and females. However, this result may not be definitive evidence of discrimination for several reasons; principle among them is the exclusion from the study of "quality" variables (such as publications, committee work, etc.). Close monitoring of departmental promotions by the various segments to alleviate any discriminatory outcome is suggested.

4. Two limitations apply to these conclusions. First, they are based on aggregate data; therefore, they do not address individual cases. Second, the low number of women faculty have presented statistical problems in some cases.

I. Introduction

The data collected by the State Board for Higher Education, through the annual HEGIS survey, have shown variations in salaries between male and female faculty members. As a result, the Organization of Women Legislators of the Maryland General Assembly asked the Commissioner for Higher Education to study the differences in salaries by sex among the faculty of the State public higher education institutions. This study was designed to analyze and determine if differences were due to factors (such as academic department and rank, highest degree obtained, etc.), or if there was possible evidence of discrimination. In doing this, the main concern was to study overall pattern, not to detect individual cases of possible discrimination. As a secondary analysis, the study also addressed the issue of promotion to rank: i.e., were females equally promoted to academic ranks (everything else being equal)? In this report are presented the results for two segments of the State's higher education system: The University of Maryland and the State Colleges and Universities.[1]

II. Analysis

To analyze the data, the Segment x HEGIS discipline[2] level was chosen with one exception.[3] The University of Maryland segment includes the following campuses: UMAB, UMBC and UMCP. Incomplete data prevented the inclusion of UMES in the study; University College's faculty is primarily part-time and was also excluded. The State Colleges and Universities include the institutions under the Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges (Bowie, Coppin, Frostburg and Salisbury State Colleges, Towson State University and the University of Baltimore), Morgan State University and St. Mary's College of Maryland.

The scope of the study was limited to full-time, permanent, faculty.[4] Departmental chairpersons, administrators, etc. were excluded. For each faculty member included in the study, the following data were collected: annual salary, type of contract (11-12 or 9-10 month contract)[5], highest degree obtained, year the highest degree was awarded, years employed in the current institution, age, academic rank,

---

1-For a thorough review of the literature, the reader is referred to the American Association of University Professors "Higher Education Salary Evaluation Kit" (Washington, D. C.: AAUP, 1977).

2-HEGIS discipline: broad categories defined as "conventional academic subdivisions of knowledge and training"; for example, Agriculture and Natural Resources, Education, Social Science, etc. (Typically, a HEGIS discipline encompasses several academic departments). Most educational data are analyzed using these categories.

3-The one exception was UMAB. The data for this campus were not aggregated to the other two campuses of the University included in this study (UMBC and UMCP), rather, they were analyzed by professional school.

4-Permanent was defined as including both tenured and non-tenured-but-on-track faculty.

5-Salaries were converted to a common base by multiplying 11-12 month salaries times 9/11.

years in current rank, HEGIS discipline and sex. Quality variables (i.e., scholarly productivity, quality of teaching, committee work, etc.) were excluded because of the problems involved in collecting data of this nature. Moreover, it was thought that quality variables wouldn't add much to the analysis of salary differentials once rank was considered.[6] They are critical, however, to any definitive analysis of promotion to rank.

The statistical method used to analyze the data was multiple regression analysis. In this method, one predicts a dependent variable (salary), using a set of independent variables (rank, years in rank, degree, year of degree, age, years in institution and sex). It was assumed that all the independent variables, except sex, were valid predictors of salary. If sex were to show up as a predictor of salary, it would indicate the possibility of discrimination. One multiple regression was done for each academic discipline which had (a) a sufficient number of faculty members; and (b) a sufficient number of faculty from both sexes. The same procedure was used to analyze promotion to rank. A new set of variables (called "dummy variables") were created to account for any possible difference in salaries between campuses of the segments. Appendix A provides more technical information on the analyses used.

III. Findings

A. The University of Maryland

Only eight disciplines and three professional schools fulfilled the requirements of size: Biological Sciences, Education, Fine and Applied Arts, Foreign Languages, Home Economics, Letters, Psychology, Social Sciences, and the schools of Dentistry, Social Work and Medicine. However, 84% of the UMBC and UMCP female faculty members are found in these disciplines; and 81% of the UMAB faculty women (excluding the School of Nursing, which has only 4 males out of 132 total faculty) are included in those professional schools.

The analysis of salaries (Table 1)[7] revealed that, in all disciplines and professional schools but one (Social Work and Community Planning), sex was not a significant predictor of salary.

The analysis of promotion to rank (Table 1) showed that, in all disciplines and professional schools but two (Fine and Applied Arts and the School of Social Work), sex was a significant predictor of promotion.

6-AAUP (1977), pp. 12-13.

7-A technical explanation of the tables is found in Appendix A.

B. State Colleges and Universities

Only nine disciplines fulfilled the requirements of size: Biological Sciences, Business and Management, Education, Fine and Applied Arts, Letters, Mathematics, Physical Sciences, Psychology and Social Sciences. However, 79% of this segment's female faculty members are found in those disciplines.[8]

The analysis of salaries (Table 2) revealed that, in all disciplines but one (Social Sciences), sex was not a significant predictor of salary. Likewise, the analysis of promotion to rank shows that, in all disciplines but two (Education and Fine and Applied Arts), sex was not a significant predictor of promotion.

IV. Discussion of Findings and Conclusions

A. The University of Maryland

The results of the analysis of salaries presented in Table 1 show a clear pattern among the predictors: academic rank was the best predictor of salary in all disciplines and schools; years in current rank was the second best predictor. The magnitude of the R^2's should be noted. This statistic is a measure of how well one can predict salary using independent variables. R^2 ranges from 0-1, 1.0 being perfect prediction. The average R^2 excluding the professional schools was .80. The high values of the R^2's, and the clear pattern among predictors, lends confidence to the results. The professional schools had lower R^2's : the average was .47. The lower R^2's indicate that salaries for faculty in the professional schools cannot be predicted with a very high degree of accuracy.[9] Indeed, in the professional schools variables not included in the study (for example, professional experience), may be more significant predictors of salary. This hypothesis (variables affecting the professional schools uniquely) is supported by the analysis of the contribution of rank to explain salaries. While this contribution is 43% (average) in the professional schools, it is 76% among non-professional school faculty. In other words, rank does not determine salary in the professional schools to the extent it does among the non-professional school faculty. For these reasons, the presence of sex as a significant predictor of salary in the School of Social Work and Community Planning should be looked at with a high degree of scepticism. Moreover, other factors must be considered in interpreting these results as evidence of discrimination. First a number of faculty members from this school were excluded because of

---

8-It should be noted that each of the nine disciplines did not include all eight institutions. Rather, in each discipline which fulfilled the requirements of size, only the institutions with faculty in that discipline were included.

9-It is interesting to note that for the professional schools' faculty, we can predict rank with a higher degree of accuracy than salary (average R^2 for the rank equations was .56), while for the non-professional schools' faculty, the reverse is true (average R^2's: .80 predicting salary and .62 predicting rank.)

missing information on salary, type of contract, etc. Second, this school does not fit the pattern of results found with other disciplines and schools: on the one hand, only in this school was sex a significant predictor of salary; on the other, sex was not a significant predictor of promotion to rank. Finally, in conducting eleven different analyses, some results may be expected to occur by chance. The overall pattern, rather than specific disciplines and/or schools, should be the primary focus of the results.

THE MAIN CONCLUSION TO BE DRAWN FROM THE ANALYSIS OF SALARIES IS THAT, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, WHEN CONTROLLING FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE, RAND, AND YEARS IN RANK, THE DIFFERENCES IN SALARIES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES DISAPPEAR.

The results of the analysis of promotion to rank presented in Table 1 show a pattern of sex being a significant predictor of promotion. However, these results are not definitive evidence of discrimination in promotions for several reasons. First, no clear pattern emerged among the predictors (as was the case in the analysis of salaries); second, the magnitude of the R^2's was relatively low. While the average R^2 in the salaries analyses was .70 (for all disciplines and schools), it was .60 in the promotion analyses. The relative low magnitude of the R^2's indicates that relevant factors were left out of the analysis. This is particularly significant considering that "quality" variables (publications, etc.), were not included. The University considers that qualitative judgments are essential in promotions. A variable closely associated with "quality" (mobility in higher education), was roughly constructed using the available data.[10] In exploratory analyses, this variable tended to reduce the role of sex as a significant predictor of rank. It was not used in the final analysis because of theoretical problems.[11] The exclusion of quality variables becomes more critical in any inference of sex discrimination from the findings when it is considered that the average percent of rank variance explained by sex was 3%. Indeed, had quality variables been available, and the same type of analysis been used, it is quite possible that sex as a significant predictor of rank would have disappeared. It is interesting to note that in the State Colleges segment, which does not place emphasis on publications, the pattern of findings was different from the University's. Third, the entry of large numbers of women into some academic disciplines has taken place only within the last ten years; therefore, it would be surprising to see proportionately as many women as men in the higher academic ranks. Finally, by using as a dependent variable a 4-valued ranking (full, associate, assistant professors and instructors) statistical problems may have been introduced (See Appendix A).

10-The mobility variable was defined as years since highest degree - years in present institution.

11-The problem with mobility thus defined is that it might be measuring a different variable for some females: temporary withdrawal from the job market (to raise children, etc.), which would be negatively correlated with promotion to rank.

WHILE NO DEFINITIVE CONCLUSION MAY BE REACHED FROM THE ANALYSIS OF PROMOTION TO RANK, THE RESULTS SHOULD NEVERTHELESS BE NOTED BY THE INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED. GIVEN THAT RANK DICTATES SALARY TO A LARGE DEGREE, DEPARTMENTAL DECISIONS REGARDING PROMOTIONS SHOULD BE CLOSELY MONITORED BY THE ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE THREE CAMPUSES TO AVOID ANY DISCRIMINATORY OUTCOME.

B. The State Colleges and Universities

As with the University, academic rank was the best predictor of salaries in all disciplines studied. Years in current rank was the second best predictor in 7 out of the 9 disciplines. The average R^2 was .85. The only discipline in which sex was a significant predictor of salary was Social Sciences. For reasons similar to those mentioned earlier regarding the School of Social Work, the result should be looked at with scepticism. First, Social Sciences had the lowest R^2; second, in conducting nine different analyses, some results may be expected to occur by chance. It is necessary, then, to focus on the overall pattern rather than on specific disciplines. As with the University, the general pattern is that:

AT THE STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, WHEN CONTROLLING FOR ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE, RANK, AND YEARS IN RANK, THE DIFFERENCES IN SALARIES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE FACULTY MEMBERS DISAPPEAR.

The promotion to rank analysis shows that the overall pattern is one in which sex is not a significant predictor of promotion. There are two exceptions: Education and Fine and Applied Arts. While publications are not emphasized by the State Colleges in promotions, other factors which were not included in the analysis might be present. This assumption seems supported by the drastic reduction in the R^2's: from .87 to .65 in Education and from .88 to .60 in the Arts. The analyses for this Segment were further complicated because of the inclusion of 8 institutions: sex x institutions interactions may have been operating.

AS A GENERAL PATTERN, SEX IS NOT A SIGNIFICANT PREDICTOR OF PROMOTION TO RANK IN THE STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Appendix A

Technical Information on the Regression Analyses

For each Segment x Discipline x Dependent Variable combination, two regressions were run. First, using stepwise regression, all independent variables were allowed to enter the equation with the condition that the F test of their regression coefficient was larger than 6.6349 (the critical F value with 1 and ∞ degrees of freedom at $p < .01$). Using the resulting significant predictors and sex, a second stepwise regression was run. All the predictors but sex went into the equation first. Then sex was included in the equation. The probability level of the regression coefficient of sex was computed using the following test:

$$\frac{\text{RSQ Change}}{(1-R^2)/N-K-1)}$$

where RSQ change: the increment in the R^2 due to sex
R^2: the full equation R^2
N: number of faculty members in given discipline
K: total number of variables in the equation

The results reported in the tables are from the second set of regressions if sex was a significant predictor. Otherwise, the results from the first regression were used.

Campuses were coded as dummy variables. The regressions for any Segment x Discipline included N-1 dummy variables, N being the number of institutions (or campuses), with faculty in that discipline.

All the statistical analyses were done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Tables 1 and 2 have two parts: results of the regression using salary as a dependent variable and using rank as a dependent variable. The first column of each part shows the independent variables which were significant predictors of the dependent variable; the second column, the percent of total variance explained by each independent variable; the third column, the F test for the beta weights; the fourth column, the beta (standardized regression coefficients) weights; the last column, the R^2. Regarding the salary equations, in both segments' data, a negative beta weight corresponding to sex means a negative outcome for females (smaller salaries). Likewise for the rank equations in the State colleges and universities; however, in the University's rank equations, a positive beta weight corresponding to sex means a negative outcome for females (lower rank).

In the salary equations, the plots of the residuals in a few disciplines showed minor abnormalities which could be attributed to the variance not being constant. This could have produced biased estimates of the regression coefficients. Also, as should be expected, there was a high degree of multicollinearity present in the data. However, the pattern of results for both segments was constant, hence lending confidence to the salary equations results.

In the rank equations, it has been pointed out that, by using as a dependent variable a 4-valued ranking, the calculation of the variance of the disturbance term might have been affected and that the analysis might have failed to deal with heteroscholasticity. An alternative formulation could have analyzed promotion to rank as discrete steps; i.e., from assistant to associate and from associate to full professor. Moreover, it seems that any definitive analysis of promotions would have to involve longitudinal data. Indeed, questions remaining to be answered are: is sex a factor in promotions, and is sex a determinant of the time it takes to be promoted.

Table 1

Regression Analyses Results: University of Maryland

	Salary					Rank				
MECIS	Independent Variable	% Variance	F	Beta	R^2	N	Independent Variable	% Variance	F	Beta	R^2
Biological Sciences	Rank	75%	317.17**	-.77		M= 71	Year Highest Degree	35%	106.26**	.60	
	Years in Rank	5%	21.47**	.25		F= 16	Highest Degree	34%	103.81**	-.48	
	Full Equation		79.61**		.80	T= 87	Sex	3%	9.71**	.21	
							Full Equation		70.61**		.73
Education	Rank	83%	1,556.61**	-.85		M=145	Age	44%	321.63**	-.08	
	Years in Rank	4%	74.09**	.21		F= 75	Highest Degree	18%	128.26**	-.50	
	Campus	1%	18.50**	-.10		T=220	Year of Highest Degree	6%	45.52**	.44	
	Full Equation		532.10**		.88		Sex	2%	16.09**	.15	
							Full Equation		124.90**		.70
Fine & Applied Arts	Rank	67%	223.48**	-.83		M= 74	Age	42%	86.72**	-.38	
	Campus	3%	10.86**	-.18		F= 26	Highest Degree	6%	12.26**	-.38	
	Full Equation		105.09**		.71	T=100	Year of Highest Degree	5%	10.98**	.38	
							Full Equation		32.84**		.53
Foreign Languages	Rank	77%	239.08**	-.78		M= 35	Highest Degree	27%	30.57**	-.41	
	Years in Rank	6%	17.6 **	.26		F= 22	Years in Institution	20%	21.22**	-.46	
	Full Equation		121.21**		.83	T= 57	Sex	7%	6.73**	.29	
							Full Equation		20.67**		.54
Home Economics	Rank	80%	156.14**	-.89		M= 17	Highest Degree	37%	38.79**	-.70	
	Full Equation		156.14**		.60	F= 25	Year of Highest Degree	22%	23.22**	.51	
						T= 42	Sex	4%	4.40*	.21	
							Full Equation		18.65**		.64
Letters	Rank	75%	481.73**	-.78		M=106	Highest Degree	37%	137.34**	-.54	
	Year of Highest Degree	3%	20.84**	-.19		F= 28	Year of Highest Degree	22%	60.73**	.63	
	Campus	1%	7.54**	.11		T=134	Years in Institution	4%	14.26**	.26	
	Full Equation		160.88**		.80		Sex	4%	13.95**	.20	
							Full Equation		58.23**		.68
Psychology	Rank	75%	231.47**	-.74		M= 48	Year of Highest Degree	54%	72.11**	.72	
	Years in Rank	6%	19.72**	.28		F= 12	Sex	3%	4.39*	.18	
	Full Equation		121.39*		.82	T= 60	Full Equation		37.56**		.57
Social Sciences	Rank	75%	770.08**	-.86		M=204	Year of Highest Degree	49%	282.58**	.84	
	Campus	1%	13.7**	.11		F= 36	Highest Degree	7%	38.34**	-.23	
	Full Equation		373.69**		.77	T=240	Years in Institution	2%	11.75**	.22	
							Sex	2%	12.20**	.15	
							Full Equation		82.18**		.59
School of Dentistry	Rank	38%	61.32**	-.62		M= 89	Years in Institution	40%	86.62**	-.38	
	Full Equation		61.32**		.38	F= 13	Age	8%	16.81**	-.32	
						T=102	Degree	5%	10.58**	-.24	
							Sex	3%	6.85*	.18	
							Full Equation		30.22**		.53
School of Social Work	Rank	50%	58.14**	-.61		M= 34	Highest Degree	29%	42.87**	-.90	
	Sex	6%	6.60*	-.25		F= 20	Year of Highest Degree	36%	53.01**	.70	
	Full Equation		32.37**		.56	T= 54	Full Equation		36.66**		.67
School of Medicine	Rank	42%	269.89**	-.49		M=279	Year of Highest Degree	38%	256.32**	.24	
	Year of Highest Degree	4%	25.34**	-.25		F= 74	Highest Degree	5%	30.96**	-.21	
	Full Equation		197.97**		.46	T=353	Age	3%	23.01**	-.39	
							Sex	2%	13.68**	.15	
							Full Equation		59.12**		.48

*p < .05
**p < .01

Note: Rank was coded 1-Professor to 4-Instructor
Sex was coded 1-Male; 2-Female
Highest Degree was coded 1-Bachelor to 4-Ph.D.

Table 2

Regression Analyses Results: State Colleges and Universities

	Salary					Rank				
HEGIS	Independent Variable	% Variance	F	Beta	R^2	N	Independent Variable	% Variance	F	Beta	R^2
Biological Science	Rank	82%	402.18**	.83		M= 50	Years in Institution	31%	53.43**	.33	
	Years in Rank	4%	20.35**	.22		F= 11	Highest Degree	16%	28.11**	.56	
	Full Equation		206.82**		.86	T= 69	Year of Highest Degree	7%	12.35**	-.40	
							Campus 1	7%	12.76**	-.31	
							Full Equation		25.83**		.6
Business & Management	Rank	78%	267.03**	.87		M= 68	Age	30%	42.98**	.45	
	Full Equation		267.03**		.78	F= 11	Highest Degree	17%	24.07**	.42	
						T= 79	Full Equation		33.08**		.5
Education	Rank	82%	2,025.49**	.69		M=198	Highest Degree	42%	398.0**	.62	
	Years in Rank	3%	68.86**	.12		F=134	Age	18%	165.36**	.24	
	Campus 6	.7%	17.94**	.08		T=332	Year of Highest Degree	2%	16.88**	-.17	
	Age	.5%	13.5**	.07			Campus 1	2%	16.82**	-.13	
	Highest Degree	.4%	9.11**	.15			Years in Institution	.8%	7.2**	.11	
	Campus 1	.6%	14.29**	-.09			Sex	.8%	7.65**	-.09	
	Year of Highest Degree	.3%	8.24**	-.09			Full Equation		101.04**		.6
	Full Equation		305.36**		.87						
Fine & Applied Arts	Rank	77%	668.33**	.71		M= 76	Years in Institution	42%	109.63**	.49	
	Years in Rank	7%	58.34**	.18		F= 32	Highest Degree	12%	31.58**	.33	
	Age	2%	20.37**	.19		T=108	Age	3%	8.62**	.21	
	Campus 4	2%	14.85**	.14			Sex	2%	6.29*	-.16	
	Full Equation		184.92**		.88		Full Equation		38.28**		.6
Letters	Rank	79%	1,122.97**	.76		M= 94	Highest Degree	37%	234.97**	.75	
	Years in Rank	5%	77.38**	.2		F= 89	Year of Highest Degree	25%	159.39**	-.34	
	Campus 7	1%	20.18**	-.14		T=183	Campus 1	7%	44.24**	-.28	
	Campus 2	1%	16.70**	-.11			Years in Institution	4%	23.66**	.24	
	Age	.5%	6.89**	.11			Full Equation		115.57**		.7
	Full Equation		246.01**		.88						
Mathematics	Rank	79%	681.36**	.83		M= 61	Highest Degree	34%	90.18**	.67	
	Years in Rank	9%	81.00**	.30		F= 19	Age	28%	74.04**	.33	
	Campus 6	2%	14.56**	.12		T= 80	Campus 1	4%	9.62**	-.2	
	Campus 7	1%	11.54**	-.12			Campus 6	3%	8.12**	.20	
	Full Equation		197.12**		.91		Years in Institution	3%	8.29**	.24	
							Full Equation		38.05**		.7
Physical Sciences	Rank	68%	280.60**	.46		M= 58	Years in Institution	40%	51.17**	.67	
	Age	10%	42.50**	.46		F= 2[illegible]	Highest Degree	12%	16.25**	.35	
	Highest Degree	6%	26.2**	.25		T= 60	Full Equation		33.21**		.5
	Full Equation		114.56**		.85						
Psychology	Rank	54%	173.01**	.69		M= 48	Age	20%	21.11**	.49	
	Years in Rank	27%	87.74**	.53		F= 17	Highest Degree	20%	20.48**	.45	
	Full Equation		128.28**		.81	T= 65	Full Equation		19.79**		.4
Social Sciences	Rank	69%	663.9**	.65		M=169	Age	37%	211.68**	.24	
	Years in Rank	7%	62.66**	.2		F= 45	Highest Degree	16%	91.29**	.60	
	Age	1%	12.29**	.17		T=214	Years in Institution	7%	39.96**	.25	
	Sex	1%	9.16**	-.1			Campus 1	3%	16.4**	-.25	
	Full Equation		187.0**		.78		Year of Highest Degree	1%	7.99**	-.19	
							Full Equation		73.46**		.6

*p<.05
**p<.01

Note: Rank was coded 1-Instructor to 4-Professor
Sex was coded 1-Male; 2-Female
Highest Degree was coded 0-Bachelor to 2-Ph.D. or equivalent